

but I did want to alert my colleagues to an amendment that I believe will be coming up this afternoon, or perhaps even later this morning. In any event, later today Senators MCCAIN, LIEBERMAN, and I will be offering an amendment to the ethics bill before us to create an Office of Public Integrity.

The American people view the way that we enforce ethics requirements on each other and on our staff as an inherently conflicted process. We set our own rules, we are our own advisers, we are our own investigators, we are our own prosecutors, we are our own judges, and we are our own juries. Even though we have some of our finest Members serving on the Ethics Committee, they cannot escape the perception that the process is plagued by conflict of interest. We do have extraordinary capable, ethical individuals serving on the Ethics Committee in the Senate. We are very fortunate to have a committee that works in harmony and that takes its job very seriously.

I believe we can preserve the important role of the Ethics Committee—and it is a vital role because the Constitution requires each House of Congress to discipline its own Members, if necessary, and we are going to preserve that absolutely critical role—but that we can make an improvement in the process by creating a congressional office, the Office of Public Integrity.

I emphasize this is part of the legislative branch. We are not talking, as some have, about creating an outside commission of judges and former Members of Congress and ethics experts. We are talking about recognizing that the Constitution clearly places responsibility within the legislative branch for taking actions, if necessary, against its own Members who violate the House or Senate rules. But we believe that process would be enhanced if we create an office of public integrity. It would be headed by a director who would be appointed by the majority and minority leaders of the Senate. That office would conduct investigations of possible ethics violations independent of any direct supervision by the Senate. So we would be assured that the public would perceive the process—the investigation—as more credible than now occurs when the Ethics Committee is investigating allegations against their colleagues.

I wish to point out, however, this is not the Shays-Meehan bill in the House, whatever the merits of that approach. This is a different approach from that taken by the Senator from Illinois, Senator OBAMA, and it is even different from the proposal Senator LIEBERMAN and I advanced in the Homeland Security markup. We have refined it still further. We narrowed the authority of the Office of Public Integrity, and I think we struck exactly the right balance between the duties of this office and the duties of the Ethics Committee. This office would conduct impartial, independent, thorough investigations and report its findings to

the Ethics Committee which then would retain authority to rule on the cases and allegations and decide what action, if any, is taken. This would enhance the public confidence that this investigation would be an independent one.

It is very difficult for us to investigate ourselves. There are friendships, there are inherent conflicts of interest. The Ethics Committee does a terrific job in the Senate. It has wonderful members serving on it, individuals of the highest integrity. But the public perception is always going to be that this is an inherently conflicted process because we are investigating ourselves. We are playing every role in the process. What we are trying to do is create an office that would conduct the investigation.

I know many of our colleagues are not comfortable with this concept. Some of them have compared it to the old special prosecutor laws. But that is not what we are doing. We are very carefully setting up a system of checks and balances with the Ethics Committee retaining all of the final authority to decide how to proceed, to decide whether subpoenas should be employed, to decide whether an investigation should go forward in the first place, and to decide the ultimate disposition of the case. The investigation would be done by this independent office.

I point out to my colleagues one of the advantages of having an independent Office of Public Integrity conduct the investigation. The public now is often skeptical of the findings and actions taken by the Ethics Committee. If the Office of Public Integrity comes to the Ethics Committee and says these allegations have been thoroughly investigated, we, an independent entity, have investigated these allegations and we find there is no truth to them, that finding is much more likely to be accepted by the public if the investigation is done by this independent office. It would have complete credibility. That would be a great advantage. It would remove the cloud of doubt and suspicion that often hangs over Members of Congress unfairly when allegations are made against them.

The reason the public often has those doubts is they know we are investigating ourselves. They know our colleagues are investigating allegations against their colleagues.

If we insert this Office of Public Integrity into the process, public confidence in the thoroughness, independence, and credibility of the investigations would be enhanced. It would in no way diminish the authority of the Ethics Committee to take the action, make the final judgments, and indeed judgments all along the way, on this case.

I reserve the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for up to 15 minutes as in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### ELIMINATING SECRET HOLDS

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I am hopeful that shortly the Senate will be voting on a measure that will take a very significant step forward by bringing sunshine and public accountability to the Senate.

If you walk the streets of this country and ask someone what a hold is in the Senate, I don't think you will get 1 out of 100 people who will have any idea what you are talking about. But the fact of the matter is, a hold in the Senate is the ability to block a piece of legislation, block a nomination from being even discussed in the Senate. As a result of a hold, the Senate will not even get a peek at a topic that may involve millions of our citizens, billions of dollars, and affect the quality of life of citizens in every corner of the land.

It would be one thing if the Senator who exercises this extraordinary tool—this tool that carries so much power with it—if that Senator would exercise the tool in public and could be held accountable. Unfortunately, holds are now placed in secret. They are done behind closed doors. The sponsor of a piece of legislation will not even know about it. It seems to me a Senate that is serious about lobbying reform absolutely must stop doing so much of its important business in secret, behind closed doors.

I will offer later in the day, I hope, with Senator GRASSLEY, Senator INHOFE, and Senator SALAZAR, an amendment to bring a bit of sunshine to the Senate. It is an amendment that would not abolish the hold. Senators' rights would be fully protected. Senator COLLINS is in the Senate, and as a result of the colloquy we had several weeks ago, this legislation also protects the Senator's right to be consulted on a piece of legislation. Certainly, that is something all Members feel is important. If there are bills that affect a Senator's State or that they have a great interest in, that Senator would have an opportunity to study the legislation and to reflect on what it means.

What we say in this bipartisan amendment is when a Senator digs in, when a Senator plans to exercise this extraordinary power, the power to block a bill or a nomination from ever being heard, we are saying that Senator has got to be held publicly accountable. What we require is that a Senator who exercises a hold would have to so state in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. They could still use their procedural rights to make sure they have a chance to oppose the legislation and to oppose it strongly, but they would be identified as the person who was so objecting.

The intelligence reauthorization bill is now being prevented from coming to this Senate as a result of a secret hold.

A lot of Senators give lengthy and eloquent speeches about fighting terrorism, but now a bill that is vital to national security is being held up in secret. It has been held up for months and months as a result of this secret hold. That ought to change.

Certainly, it ought to change if Senators are serious about lobbying reforms because one of the best ways for lobbyists to work their will is to have procedures that help them behind closed doors. That is what the secret hold is all about. It is written nowhere in the Senate rules, but it has become one of the most significant and powerful tools a Senator can exercise. It is done without any public accountability at all.

There has been a bit of irony in the last couple of days about this legislation. I thought it was going to come up already, given the fact that we had come back from the recess. I was under the impression that would be the first order of business. But we could not get to the bipartisan measure to abolish secret holds because, lo and behold, there was a secret hold on an amendment to try to get the Senate to do its business in public. That pretty much says it all. Not only do we have secret holds on national security legislation, legislation that would make a real difference in terms of striking a balance between fighting terrorism ferociously and protecting civil liberties, not only do we have national security legislation being held up, but even efforts to bring about basic reforms such as openness and sunshine for the Senate are being held up as a result of this secret procedure.

I emphasize what the change will mean for the Senate. No longer if this change is put in place will staff be able to keep secret from Members an objection; no longer will leadership be the only one to know about an objection; no longer will it be possible for a Senator to be kept in the dark about something they have worked on for years and years. The fact is, Senator GRASSLEY and I have worked on this legislation for a full decade.

Senator LOTT, the chairman of the Rules Committee, has been particularly helpful in terms of working with us on this measure. There have been hearings. Senator BYRD, who, of course, knows more about the Senate rules than anyone in the history of this Senate, has been very helpful in terms of giving us background about what we ought to do. This amendment puts the burden on the person who ought to be held publicly accountable: squarely on the shoulders of an objector. The person who exercises a hold will be identified and colleagues can discuss with that person how to move forward in a bipartisan way.

No Senator is going to be stripped of their rights. No Senator is going to be kept from protecting constituents that have serious concerns about legislation. But with the right to stand up for your view and to object to a piece of

legislation, there ought to be some responsibility. There ought to be some accountability.

I find it stunning the Senate would even consider lobbying reform without an effort to do its business in public. We have already spent several days on this legislation. Hopefully, it will be completed shortly. It seems to me one of the most obvious reforms that Senators ought to be in favor of, if this Senate is serious about reform, is doing its business in public.

Nowhere in the Senate rules does it say anything about secret holds. Nowhere is it written down that a Senator can exercise this enormous power and do it without any accountability at all.

Senator GRASSLEY and I believe it is time to bring some sunshine for the Senate and for Senators to do the people's business in public. Secret holds have been the bane of the Senate for decades. Back in the 101st Congress, then-majority Bob Dole said:

I have never understood why Republicans put a hold on Republican nominees. Maybe I will figure it out some day. I have been working on it. I have not quite understood it.

In that same Congress, former Senator John Glenn observed:

... as one hold would come off, there was agreement another one would be put on, so that no one really had to identify themselves. The objecting Senator would remain anonymous. So much for sunshine in the United States Senate.

Those are the words of one of our most respected colleagues, John Glenn, words that I hope Senators will remember later in the day when we will have a chance to vote on a bipartisan amendment to bring some sunlight to the Senate and some openness in the way the Senate conducts the public's business.

When we have important national security legislation held hostage today by a secret hold, that alone says that this Senate needs to change the way it does business. It ought to do its business in the open. It ought to do its business in a way that will hold Senators accountable.

After 10 years, Senator GRASSLEY and I have watched these secret holds block legislation, block nominations in a way that does a disservice to all the people we represent.

We are going to have a chance to end this. We are going to have a chance to ensure that while Senators can exercise their rights and debate topics that they feel strongly about, they can also be held publicly accountable.

I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BURR). Without objection, it is so ordered.

## ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, we are beyond 12:30 p.m. Thus, I ask unanimous consent to delay the recess until we complete, in a few minutes, two items of business we will be addressing.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, we are going to address two issues, and those are the issue surrounding the lobbying bill, which is on the floor now, and we will march through that issue—the Democratic leader and I will explain to our colleagues what has just been done—and then also we expect to address the issue surrounding immigration and the cloture vote that is scheduled this afternoon.

## LEGISLATIVE TRANSPARENCY AND ACCOUNTABILITY ACT OF 2006—Resumed

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the pending business.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 2349) to provide greater transparency in the legislative process.

Pending:

Wyden/Grassley amendment No. 2944, to establish as a standing order of the Senate a requirement that a Senator publicly disclose a notice of intent to object to proceeding to any measure or matter.

Schumer amendment No. 2959 (to amendment No. 2944), to prohibit any foreign-government-owned or controlled company that recognized the Taliban as the legitimate government of Afghanistan during the Taliban's rule between 1996–2001, may own, lease, operate, or manage real property or facility at a United States port.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York.

## AMENDMENT NO. 2959 WITHDRAWN

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, since I offered the amendment on the Dubai Ports World, a lot has happened. In fact, Dubai Ports World has agreed to sell its U.S. operations, and so it will have no control over them. That will happen over the next several months. The administration has agreed that should be what happens.

Obviously, we are going to keep a watchful eye on the deal, and should for some reason—and I have no expectation this will occur—the deal not be allowed, we would want to bring the amendment back to the floor. The majority leader has graciously agreed that we would be allowed to do so, although I have no expectation that will happen.

So I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the pending amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The majority leader.

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, let me add to what the distinguished Senator from New York just said. First of all, I thank him, through the Chair, for his cooperation on an issue which is constantly evolving, but it looks as if it is well underway to satisfy everybody's